

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

Added claim 103 is supported by the teaching at paragraph [0045] of the published application which teaches "The process is controlled to create a conformal, uniform thickness." There is no teaching of this in the cited references.

Added claims 104 to 114 are supported by the originally filed claims, figures and specification.

Typographical errors have been corrected in claim 94.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 49, 81, 90, 91 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823). Applicants respectfully disagree and request withdrawal of this rejection. Eldridge et al. is not prior art under 35 USC 102 as described in the Applicants' Appeal Brief filed 07/24/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823) in view of Saruwatari et al (US 5,233,011). Applicants respectfully disagree and request withdrawal of this rejection. Eldridge et al. is not prior art under 35 USC 102 as described in Applicants' Appeal Brief filed 07/24/2009.

Claims 86, 88 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823) in view of Nakata et al (US 5,665,610). Applicants

respectfully disagree and request withdrawal of this rejection. Eldridge et al. is not prior art under 35 USC 102 as described in Applicants' Appeal Brief filed 07/24/2009.

As stated previously Applicants' claims without the amendments herein are patentable over the cited references. To further prosecution Applicants make the following comments.

In the Examiner's answer dated 09/16/2009 at the bottom of page 10 the Answer refers to US 4,821,148 (US '148). US '148 is directed to forming a metal compound which is not described as being a dielectric. Moreover, there is no teaching of forming the metal containing benzotriazole on an elongate electrical conductor with "an exposed portion of said elongated electrical conductor that is not coated with said dielectric coating" as recited in claim 49. The process of US '148 would entirely coat a conductive material of Al or Cu with an Al or Cu containing benzotriazole without any exposed region of the Al or Cu surface. Thus Applicants' claims as amended cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references.

In view of the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner,... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

By: /Daniel P. Morris/
Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598